DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 684 JC 780 239

AUTHOR Friedlander, Jack
TITLE Evaluation Report of the Student Accountability Model Workshops.
INSTITUTION Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
PUB DATE 26 May 78
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Followup Studies; Inservice Programs; *Junior Colleges; Program Evaluation; Research Methodology; *Research Skills; *Vocational Directors; Vocational Education; *Vocational Followup; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Student Accountability Model

ABSTRACT

Pre-tests, post-tests, and on-site observations were used to evaluate a series of workshops designed to prepare California community college occupational personnel for conducting follow-up studies using Student Accountability Model (SAM) materials and methods. Pre-tests elicited information on participants' positions at their respective colleges, familiarity with SAM, and the degree to which they felt confident in implementing SAM procedures. Post-tests assessed whether participants gained increased understanding of SAM as a result of the workshops. On-site observations evaluated clarity of presentations, appropriateness of workshop information, and participant's exchange of experiences in using SAM. Results revealed that the established objectives were successfully achieved, although wide discrepancies in prior knowledge of SAM among representatives of colleges using SAM and those not using it may have detracted somewhat from the effectiveness of the workshops. Most participants indicated that SAM was very appropriate at their campuses, although they identified some serious problems undermining SAM's effectiveness: lack of adequate resources to implement and maintain SAM, lack of administrator support, lack of clear definitions for classifying occupational courses and students, and difficulty in obtaining high return rates to mailed questionnaires. (JR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153684

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jack Friedlander

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluation Report

of the

Student Accountability Model

Workshops

Jack Friedlander

Center for the Study of Community Colleges

Los Angeles

May 26, 1978

JC 780 239

Evaluation of the Student Accountability Model Workshops

In Spring 1978 the California Community College Student Accountability Model (SAM) Project conducted five Education Professions Development Act (EPDA)-funded workshops designed to prepare college occupational personnel for conducting meaningful follow-up studies using SAM. The workshops were presented during April, 1978, in five locations throughout the state. The workshops were six-hour, one-day sessions. A total of 117 community college personnel participated in these workshops. The four major objectives of the April, 1978 SAM workshops were:

1) Acquaint key personnel concerned with community college occupational education (e.g., occupational deans, department chairpersons, research directors, counselors) with the SAM system and its benefits to them.

2) Improve participants' skills in conducting follow-up studies using SAM.

3) Offer instruction and information which would enable the workshop participants to implement the following procedures - identify and classify "program completers and leavers"; design and implement a follow-up plan for these students; obtain adequate response rates to surveys; obtain useful input from employers; use information to complete Vocational Education Act governmental follow-up reporting

forms; and use information to effect institutional program changes.

4) Provide participants with a sufficient understanding of SAM so that they could pass along this information to others in their college or district.

Since the workshops were financed through an EPDA grant, an evaluation of their effectiveness to promote professional growth and development was called for. This study reports on the evaluation of the SAM workshops.

Method

Pretests, post-tests, and on-site observations were used to assess the extent to which the four major objectives of the Spring, 1978 SAM workshops were attained. A description of the three data collection methods and the objectives they were designed to assess are presented below.

Pretest

The pretest, administered at the start of each workshop, was designed to obtain the following information from the program participants: The position they held at their college (e.g., counselor, department chairperson, etc); familiarity with SAM (determined by whether SAM was used at their college); and the degree to which the participants felt confident in implementing each of ten SAM procedures that were to be presented during the workshops. In addition, respondents to the pretest were asked to indicate whether occupational students were systematically followed-up at their institution and, if

not, what obstacles were preventing their college from implementing such a procedure.

Post-test

The post-test was administered to the participants during the last ten minutes of each workshop. The instrument was designed to assess the extent to which participants felt their understanding of SAM increased as a result of the workshop, and to assess the degree to which participants felt confident in implementing each of ten SAM procedures that were presented during the workshop. The ten items which assessed participants' confidence in implementing SAM follow-up procedures paralleled those on the pretest. This was done in order to measure the extent to which respondents gained confidence in their ability to implement basic SAM follow-up procedures as a result of the workshop.

In addition, participants were asked to comment on the advantages and disadvantages of using SAM at their colleges. Responses to this item (along with those to the pretest item which asked participants to identify obstacles that were preventing their colleges from implementing the follow-up component of SAM) were used to assess the extent to which workshop attendants could translate the knowledge gained at the workshop into practice at the various colleges. Samples of the pretest and post-test used in this study are presented in Appendix A.

Observational Techniques

Three important aspects of the workshop, not assessed directly either by the pre- or post-test, were: (1) the extent to which participants found the presentations to be clear; (2) the extent to

which participants found the information presented to be appropriate to their concerns; and (3) the extent to which participants exchanged information with one another concerning their experiences in using SAM. Information on each of the areas listed above was obtained by the evaluator through observations and through informed discussions with participants at those workshops (three out of five) that were held in Southern California.

Results[1]

Workshop Attendance Data

The Spring 1978 SAM workshop series served 117 college staff members from 53 California community colleges. Attendance for each workshop was in descending order: Oakland (41); Los Angeles (28); San Diego (27); Visalia (14); and Santa Ana (7). It should be noted that only 117 of the 173 (67.7%) college staff members who pre-enrolled for the workshops actually attended. The colleges represented at the workshops are presented in Appendix G.

Pre-Workshop Familiarity with SAM

One objective of this study was to identify participants' understanding of SAM at the start of the workshops. This objective was met by having participants indicate on a four-point scale (1=not confident; 4=very confident) the extent to which they felt confident in implementing each of ten basic SAM procedures. The responses to these items as presented in Table 1 show that there was much diversity among the participants in their entry level understanding of the ten basic SAM procedures that were to be covered in the workshops.

---

1. Results for the five workshops are reported individually in Appendices B through F respectfully.

TABLE 1

Participant Pre-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	19.0	35.2	33.3	12.4
Identify major field of occupational students	6.7	39.0	37.1	17.1
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	53.3	31.4	14.3	1.0
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	36.5	34.6	22.1	6.7
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	36.5	42.3	15.4	5.8
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	39.4	39.4	14.4	6.7
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	13.3	37.1	33.3	16.2
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	22.9	37.1	30.5	9.5
Gather useful information from employers	26.0	44.2	22.1	7.7
Obtain adequate response rates from students	39.0	45.7	11.4	3.8

For example, 45 (45.7%) percent of those attending the workshops reported that they were either "confident" (33.3%) or "very confident" (12.4%) in identifying and classifying program completers and leavers while 19 percent of the participants reported little or no confidence in conducting such identifications and classifications. Similarly, just under 30 (28.8%) percent of the respondents felt confident (22.1%) or very confident (6.7%) of their ability to obtain follow-up information from program completers before they leave college while just over 35 (36.5%) percent of the participants said that they were not confident in their ability to implement this procedure.

Additional evidence of the wide differences in the conference attendees' initial knowledge of SAM was provided by the post-test item which asked participants to indicate on a five-point scale (1= very little understanding; 5=very good understanding) the extent to which they understood SAM at the start of the workshop. The data presented in Table 2 reveal that 25 percent of the respondents reported that they had a "good" (17.5%) or "very good" (7.2%) understanding of SAM before the workshop while 30 (29.9%) percent of the participants rated their understanding of SAM "very little." The findings presented in Tables 1 and 2 suggest that for any given topic a relatively high percentage of the workshop attendees may have found that the level at which it was presented was either too elementary or too advanced.

TABLE 2

Participant Understanding of SAM Before the Workshop

Level of Understanding	Percentage of Respondents
Very Little	29.9
Some	25.8
Fairly Good	19.6
Good	17.5
Very Good	7.2

Thus it appears that there were two rather distinct groups that attended the Spring, 1978 EPDA workshops. Each had its own special needs. Representatives of non-SAM colleges may have been primarily interested in learning about SAM, its benefits, and the steps needed to implement the model at their institutions. Representatives of "SAM-colleges" may have been primarily interested in learning the newest SAM follow-up procedures and techniques in order to strengthen their systems.

Post-Workshop Understanding of SAM

One of the major objectives of the SAM workshops was to acquaint occupational educators with the SAM system. Responses to the post-test items -- which asked participants to rate their understanding of SAM before and after the workshop -- were used to assess the degree to which this project objective was attained. The data in Table 3 demonstrate that at the conclusion of the workshops nearly all (97.9%) of the participants reported that they had at least a "fairly good" understanding of SAM and just over 60 (61.8%) percent of the respondents rated their understanding of SAM "good" or "very good." This latter figure represents a substantial increase (36.1%) in the percentage of participants who reported that they had at least a "good" understanding of SAM at the start of the workshops. Together, these findings demonstrate that the workshops were very effective in familiarizing participants with the SAM system.

TABLE 3

Participant Understanding of SAM Before and After the Workshops

Level of Understanding	Before Workshop	After Workshop	Change in Percent
	(Percentages)		
Very Little	29.9	-----	-29.9
Some	25.8	2.1	-23.7
Fairly Good	19.6	36.1	+16.5
Good	17.5	42.3	+24.8
Very Good	7.2	19.5	+12.3

A second major objective of the Spring, 1978 EPDA workshops was to present information which would enable participants to implement basic follow-up procedures using SAM. The attainment of this objective was assessed by examining the responses to the post-test items on which the participants indicated their confidence in implementing each of ten follow-up procedures presented in the workshops.

TABLE 4

Participant Post-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	2.1	27.8	51.5	18.6
Identify major field of occupational students	3.1	21.9	50.0	25.0
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	20.6	47.4	24.7	7.2
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	3.1	36.1	52.6	8.2
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	6.2	43.3	41.2	9.3
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	4.1	37.1	45.4	13.4
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	3.1	21.6	54.6	20.6
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	8.3	58.3	28.1	5.2
Gather useful information from employers	5.2	32.3	49.0	13.5
Obtain adequate response rates from students	16.8	40.0	38.9	4.2

The results reported in Table 4 show that over 50 percent of the respondents reported that they were "confident" or "very confident" in implementing seven of the ten SAM follow-up procedures and with two exceptions -- (1) verifying and updating addresses of former occupational students; and (2) obtaining adequate response rates from students -- over 90 percent of the participants indicated that they were at least "somewhat confident" in implementing the SAM procedures. These findings indicate that, in general, the objective of training workshop participants to conduct meaningful follow-up studies using SAM was achieved.

It is important to note that there were four follow-up procedures that approximately 50 percent or more of the participants felt less than "confident" in implementing. These procedures were: verifying and updating addresses of former occupational students; obtaining information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms; obtaining adequate response rates to mailed surveys; and locating and obtaining information from program leavers before or shortly after they left college. These findings indicate that more emphasis should be given to these four follow-up procedures in future SAM workshops.

A third major objective of the Spring, 1978 SAM workshops was to improve participants' follow-up skills. In order to measure the extent to which learning occurred during the training sessions, participants' level of confidence in implementing each of the ten follow-up procedures at the start of the workshop were compared to their confidence level at the end of the workshop. The results of the

correlated t-tests presented in Table 5 reveals that attendance at the workshops resulted in significant ($p < .001$) gains in the participants' confidence in implementing nine of the ten SAM follow-up procedures. The one procedure in which there was very little improvement was in obtaining information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms. A relatively high percentage of the participants did not feel very confident in implementing this procedure either before or after the training session. Thus, with one exception, the workshops were very successful in improving the occupational educators' skills in conducting follow-up studies using SAM.

TABLE 5

Comparisons of Participants' Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures Before and After the Workshop

SAM Procedure	Pretest Mean	Post-test Mean	Difference Between Means	Standard Deviation	T-value
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	2.40	2.87	+.47	.886	5.09^{xxx}
Identify major fields of occupational students	2.61	2.99	+.38	.881	4.07^{xxx}
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	1.57	2.20	+.63	.939	6.37^{xxx}
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	2.01	2.65	+.64	.903	6.77^{xxx}
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after leaving college	1.94	2.54	+.60	1.00	5.67^{xxx}
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after they leave college	1.89	2.68	+.79	.918	8.15^{xxx}
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	2.49	2.92	+.43	.845	4.84^{xxx}
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	2.24	2.31	+.07	.981	.64$^{N.S.}$
Gather useful information from employers	2.14	2.72	+.58	1.04	5.29^{xxx}
Obtain adequate response rates from students	1.81	2.33	+.52	1.04	4.66^{xxx}

N.S.= Not significant at the .05 confidence level.
x = Significant at the .05 confidence level.
xx = Significant at the .01 confidence level.
xxx = Significant at the .001 confidence level.

A fourth major objective of the Spring, 1978 EPDA workshops was to provide participants with a sufficient understanding of SAM so that they could pass along this information to others in their college or district. In order to achieve this objective at least two corditions, in addition to participants' adequate understanding of SAM, would have to be met: (1) participants would have to feel SAM is appropriate for their college; and (2) participants would have to feel that there were no major obstacles preventing the successful implementation or expansion of SAM at their college. Responses to two open-ended items were used to assess the extent to which the conditions enumerated above were satisfied. One item asked participants to comment on whether the student accounting component and the follow-up component of SAM were appropriate for their campus. The other item asked participants to identify obstacles, if any, that were preventing their college from successfully implementing the SAM follow-up component. The comments made on the open-ended items were sorted into six categories: one was concerned with the advantages of SAM; the other five were concerned with obstacles preventing SAM from being successfully implemented. It is important to note that the unit of analysis for this part of the study was the comment and not the individual respondent. That is, each comment made by a participant was placed into the appropriate response category.

TABLE 6

Summary of Participant Comments Concerning the Advantages and the Limitations of Implementing SAM

Number of Participants Who Made Comment	Comments
	Advantages of SAM
73	SAM is appropriate for achieving its primary objectives.
	Limitations of Implementing SAM
31	Insufficient resources (e.g., time, staff, money) to implement and maintain SAM.
24	Data processing limitations (e.g., insufficient computer time, incomplete data base, lack of trained programmers, absence of computer program to run SAM).
16	Lack of adequate support from campus administrators (e.g., poor communication, lack of organization, insufficient involvement on the part of faculty and administrators).
10	Difficulty in obtaining high return rates to mailed questionnaires.
9	Lack of common definitions for classifying courses and students.

The data presented in Table 6 indicate that the participants regarded SAM as being appropriate for achieving its primary objectives; but there were five serious problems undermining the model's effectiveness. Two of the problems were related to weaknesses in SAM. They were: "Lack of clear definitions for classifying courses and students," and "difficulty in obtaining a high return rate to mailed questionnaires." The other three obstacles preventing the successful implementation of SAM were related to the lack of institutional support. These were: "Insufficient resources (e.g., time, staff, money) to implement and maintain SAM"; "Inadequate data processing capabilities"

(e.g., insufficient computer time, incomplete data base, limited programming assistance); and "Lack of adequate support from campus administrators."

These findings suggest that workshop participants' effectiveness to further the development of SAM at their college will be dependent, in part, on the extent to which the five obstacles impeding the successful implementation and maintenance of SAM are overcome.

Evaluator's Observations

Three questions not directly assessed by either the pre- or post-tests concerned the effectiveness of the SAM workshops. These questions were whether the training sessions were well-organized; whether the instructor and media presentations were clear and easy to follow; and whether the information presented was appropriate to the needs of the workshop participants. Answers to these questions were obtained at three of the workshops by the evaluator through a variety of observational techniques. These included direct questionning, informal conversations, and subjective impressions of the evaluator.

The information obtained from these three data sources indicated that most of the participants felt that the training sessions were well organized and that the instructors' presentations (including media) were clear and easy to follow. It is likely that these two factors contributed substantially to the significant increase in the participants' understanding of SAM that occurred between the beginning and the end of the workshops.

As previously noted, there were at least two rather distinct groups of participants that attended the Spring, 1978 SAM workshops. One group, which accounted for 29.9 percent of the participants, entered the workshops with a very limited understanding of SAM. The second group, which comprised 24.7 percent of the participants, already had a good understanding of SAM before the workshops began. Another group had a moderate understanding of the model. One factor which may have contributed to the wide differences in participants' pre-conference understanding of SAM was simply that SAM may or may not have been used at their college. In order to examine whether this assumption was in fact true, a comparison was made between the participants in those colleges that did not use SAM and those that did in respect to their understanding of the system. The results presented in Table 7 show that participants from colleges where SAM was used were much more likely to have a greater understanding of the model at the start of the workshops than participants from colleges where SAM was not instituted (36.1% vs. 14.8%). The magnitude of these differences is evidenced in the finding that 42.6 percent of the participants from non-SAM colleges rated their understanding of SAM as slight while 8.3 percent of the participants from SAM colleges rated their understanding as such.

TABLE 7

Pre-Workshop Understanding of SAM by Participants Whose Colleges Use SAM and by Participants Whose Colleges Do Not Use SAM

Method Used by College to Identify Occupational Students	Participants' Understanding of SAM (Percentages)				
	Very Little	Some	Fairly Good	Good	Very Good
SAM	8.3	27.8	27.8	27.8	8.3
System other than SAM	42.6	25.9	16.7	11.1	3.7

Since the workshops were designed primarily to acquaint community college personnel with the SAM system and its benefits to them, the level at which the instruction was most appropriately addressed was to those participants who entered the workshops with a poor understanding of SAM. This observation was verified by the evaluator through conversations with the workshop participants.

Although respondents in the high initial understanding group were already familiar with much of the information presented, the results to the post-test showed that many still benefitted from the training sessions. However, a number of participants in this group noted that they would have found it profitable if the workshops had included more extensive discussions and demonstrations of new methods of performing SAM procedures (e.g., designing survey instruments and increasing response rates); added discussion of SAM; increased opportunities for college representatives to exchange information with their colleagues concerning their experiences with SAM; and further discussions on steps advocates of SAM could take to help overcome institutional factors such as insufficient resources and lack of

administrative support, which serve to undermine SAM's effectiveness. It should be noted that many of these topics were discussed by the participants during the luncheons, and, to a lesser extent, in workshop question and answer sessions.

Summary

The results of this evaluation, based on pretests, post-tests, and observational techniques, reveal that the objectives established for the Spring, 1978 EPDA SAM workshops were successfully achieved. More specifically, the findings of this study demonstrated that the training sessions were well organized; the instructor and media presentations were clear and easy to follow; there was a significant increase in participants' confidence in implementing nine of the ten SAM follow-up procedures; there were substantial gains in participants' overall understanding of SAM; and, at the end of the workshops, nearly all of the participants indicated that they had at least a "fairly good" understanding of SAM.

Additional findings reported in this study were: (1) approximately 50 percent or more of the participants stated that they did not feel much confidence in their ability to implement the following SAM procedures -- verifying and updating addresses of former occupational students; obtaining information to complete governmental vocational education follow-up forms; obtaining adequate response rates to mailed surveys; and locating and obtaining information from program leavers before or shortly after they left college; (2) most of the respondents indicated that SAM was very appropriate at their

campuses in terms of achieving its primary objectives; (3) participants identified five serious problems undermining SAM's effectiveness. They were: lack of adequate resources to implement and maintain SAM; lack of campus administrator support for the system; lack of clear definitions for classifying courses and students; and difficulty in obtaining a high return rate to mailed questionnaires.

Recommendations

The substantial increases that occurred among nearly all of the training session participants, both in terms of their overall understanding of the model and their confidence in implementing basic SAM follow-up procedures demonstrate that the major objectives of the Spring, 1978 EPDA SAM workshops were met. These findings, along with the high degree of participant satisfaction with the benefits derived from the training sessions indicate that the workshops proved to be of much value and as such should be continued.

One factor which detracted from the overall success of the Spring, 1978 SAM workshops was the large number of persons who pre-enrolled for the training sessions but did not attend. This suggests that many of the "no shows" may have felt the costs (e.g., time lost from work) of attending the workshop on the day is was scheduled exceeded the benefits they expected to gain from attending. Therefore, if conference planners wish to improve attendance they should make a concerted effort to increase the incentives of potential audiences to attend the workshops. The following are among the steps that could be taken to achieve this:

1) Conduct a study to identify the aspects of SAM that potential audiences would like to have covered in the workshop. This information can be easily obtained from mailed surveys, telephone interviews, and pre-workshop meetings.

2) Select topics that are directly related to the participants' immediate concerns. If participants feel that the outcome of the conference can help them to improve their performance of the SAM-activities, the value of the workshop will increase for them.

3) Involve potential attendees in the development of the workshops. This can be achieved by asking those who pre-enrolled to provide feedback concerning the tentative agenda of the SAM workshops. It seems reasonable to assume that people who have had some input into planning the workshop will find the topics covered to be more closely aligned to their interests than if they had no input into the program. In addition, this added communication between the planners and potential participants should maintain or increase the level of interest in the workshop.

4) Inform those who pre-enrolled, through letters or pamphlets, of any revised workshop agenda, the program objectives, and the benefits participants can expect to gain from attending the training sessions. This information should be communicated in a manner to generate excitement about the workshop.

The major weakness of the Spring, 1978 workshops was that participants differed substantially in their initial understanding of SAM and,

as a result, in the expectations they had for the workshop. Among the steps conference planners could take to prevent having a heterogeneous audience with respect to their basic understanding of SAM are:

1) Conduct a study of potential workshop participants -- those persons holding different staff positions at different colleges -- to identify the topics they would like to have covered in a workshop and at what level of sophistication they thought the information should be presented. If this step had been taken by the planners of the SAM workshops, they would have found that the representatives of colleges where SAM was well-established had a much greater understanding of the model than did the representatives of colleges where SAM was not fully implemented.

2) Write objectives for the workshops that are both congruent with the primary concerns of the target population and compatible with participant understanding and experience with SAM.

3) Determine those planning to attend the workshops. Once this is known, information should be obtained on what the participants know about SAM; what they don't know; what experiences they have had or anticipate having with the model; and why they are planning to attend the workshop. Responses to the above questions could be obtained by mailed questionnaires or by structured telephone interviews. One way of directly assessing the participants' understanding of SAM would be to administer the pretest similar to the one used in the present evaluation (Appendix F) to pre-enrollees several weeks before the workshop. Had this been done, workshop

planners would have learned: (a) there were large differences among the participants in their understanding and experiences with SAM; (b) participants were much more confident in implementing some SAM procedures than others; and (c) there were certain systemic and institutional problems that were undermining the effectiveness of SAM. If the program planners had been provided with this information before the start of the workshops, they could have made the necessary adjustments which would have enhanced the effectiveness of the training sessions.

In sum, the Spring, 1978 EPDA SAM workshops were very successful. However, the effectiveness of the training sessions could have been greater if more effort had been made to identify the unique concerns of participants who attended the workshops and if the workshops had been designed to meet the special problems and concerns identified.

Appendices

Appendix A----------Pretest and Post-test Instruments--------26-30
Used in Evaluation

Appendix B----------Results for Los Angeles Workshop----------31-34

Appendix C----------Results for Oakland Workshop----------35-38

Appendix D----------Results for San Diego Workshop----------39-42

Appendix E----------Results for Santa Ana Workshop----------43-46

Appendix F----------Results for Visalia Workshop----------47-50

Appendix G----------List of Colleges Represented at----------51
Spring, 1978 SAM Workshops

Appendix H----------Description of the Center for the---------52
Study of Community Colleges

Appendix A

Pretest and Post-test Questionnaires

Used in the Evaluation Study

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 477-8093

SPRING, 1978, STUDENT ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL WORKSHOP

PRETEST

Instructions

The overall objective of the Student Accountability Model (SAM) is to provide assistance to the California Community Colleges in:

1.) Identifying occupational students

2.) Planning follow-up procedures for occupational students

This project is being sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education. As a consequence, an evaluation of these SAM workshops is required.

This form comprises the "pre-test." It should be completed by each person attending the workshop. Your responses to the questions on this form will help us to evaluate the effectiveness of this workshop. This evaluation is being conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles.

PRETEST

This workshop is being held at:

College_____ _____
(Name of City)

What position do you hold at your college? Please circle the appropriate response.

a. Counselor
b. Faculty
c. Occupational Program Administrator
d. General Administrator
e. Department/Division Chairperson
f. Special Program Coordinator
g. Other_____
(Please Note)

Instructions: Please answer the following questions in terms of the procedures presently used at your college.

1. What method does your college use to identify a student as an occupational student? Please put a check mark next to the appropriate response.

_____ Student Accountability Model (SAM)
_____ System (Other than either SAM or Student Declaration)
_____ Student Declaration and System
_____ Student Declaration Only
_____ Don't know -- Uncertain
_____ Other_____
(Please Note)

2. a. Is there a systematic follow-up procedure used in your college or department? Please circle the appropriate response. Yes No (If not, please skip to Item 2d.)

b. Who is responsible for implementing the follow-up procedure (e.g., Occupational Dean, Department Chairperson, Research Officer)?

_____(Please note position)

c. Please describe briefly the follow-up procedure used.

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. What obstacles, if any, are preventing your college from implementing a systematic follow-up procedure for occupational students? Please describe briefly. If there is a systematic follow-up procedure used in your college, skip this item.

_____

_____

_____

(Please complete items on reverse side.)

3. Please indicate the extent to which you feel confident in implementing each of the following procedures. Please check the appropriate response.

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Identify and classify program completers and leavers.	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Identify the major field of occupational students.	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Verify and update addresses of former occupational students.	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Obtain pertinent "follow-up" information from program completers before they leave college.	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college.	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Develop and implement plans for preparing students to provide college with needed information after they leave school.	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students.	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms.	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Gather useful information from employers.	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Obtain adequate response rates from students	_____	_____	_____	_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form.

POST-TEST

This workshop is being held at:

College_____ _____
(Name of City)

What position do you hold at your college? Please circle the appropriate response.

a. Counselor
b. Faculty
c. Occupational Program Administrator
d. General Administrator
e. Department/Division Chairperson
f. Special Program Coordinator
g. Other_____
(Please Note)

The objective of this workshop was to provide you with some information about the Student Accountability Model (SAM). The questions listed below are intended to test our effectiveness in presenting SAM to you.

1. Please indicate the extent to which you feel confident in implementing each of the following procedures. Please check the appropriate response.

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Identify and classify program completers and leavers.	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Identify the major field of occupational students.	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Verify and update addresses of former occupational students.	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Obtain pertinent "follow-up" information from program completers before they leave college.	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college.	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Develop and implement plans for preparing students to provide college with needed information after they leave school.	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students.	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Please complete items on reverse side.)

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
h. Obtain adequate response rates from students.	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms.	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Gather useful information from employers.	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. To what extent did you understand SAM before this workshop?

   a. Very Little b. Some c. Fairly Good d. Good e. Very Good

3. To what extent do you now understand SAM?

   a. Very Little b. Some c. Fairly Good d. Good e. Very Good

4. The primary objective of SAM is to provide a system of procedures for identifying and describing California Community College Occupational students and for obtaining information about these students after they leave college, in order to:

   a. Complete forms required for governmental agencies, and

   b. evaluate and plan occupational programs.

   Overall, how useful do you think SAM is for accomplishing these objectives at your campus? Please comment briefly on the primary strengths and short-comings of using SAM at your campus.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form.

Appendix B

Participant Understanding of SAM Before and After the Workshops
Los Angeles Workshop (N=26)

Level of Understanding	Before Workshop (Percentages)	After Workshop	Change in Percent
Very Little	34.6	----	-34.6
Some	34.6	----	-34.6
Fairly Good	15.4	46.2	+30.8
Good	11.5	38.5	+27.0
Very Good	3.8	15.4	+11.6

Appendix B

Participant Pre-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Los Angeles Workshop (N=29)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	19.2	50.0	19.2	11.5
Identify major field of occupational students	3.8	42.3	38.5	15.4
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	61.5	23.1	15.4	----
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	46.2	30.8	23.1	----
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	53.8	30.8	11.5	3.8
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	46.2	38.5	7.7	7.7
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	7.7	46.2	30.8	15.4
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	23.1	53.8	19.2	3.8
Gather useful information from employers	15.4	61.5	11.5	11.5
Obtain adequate response rates from students	42.3	53.8	3.8	----

Participant Post-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Los Angeles Workshop (N=29)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	3.7	29.6	48.1	18.5
Identify major field of occupational students	3.7	29.6	40.7	25.9
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	29.6	48.1	18.5	3.7
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	3.7	40.7	44.4	11.1
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	7.4	51.9	29.6	11.1
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	7.4	33.3	40.7	18.5
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	3.7	14.8	59.3	22.2
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	11.5	65.4	15.4	7.7
Gather useful information from employers	7.7	50.0	34.6	7.7
Obtain adequate response rates from students	15.4	57.7	26.9	----

Appendix B

Comparisons of Participants' Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures Before and After the Workshop

Los Angeles Workshop (N=29)

SAM Procedure	Pretest Mean	Post-test Mean	Difference Between Means	Standard Deviation	T-value
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	2.21	2.79	+.58	1.02	2.81^{xx}
Identify major fields of occupational students	2.63	2.88	+.25	.79	1.54$^{N.S.}$
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	1.42	1.92	+.50	.93	2.63^{x}
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	1.75	2.50	+.75	1.07	3.42^{xx}
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after leaving college	1.63	2.38	+.75	.94	3.89^{xxx}
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after they leave college	1.71	2.58	+.88	.95	4.53^{xxx}
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	2.50	2.96	+.46	.83	2.70^{xx}
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	2.00	2.17	+.17	.89	.94$^{N.S.}$
Gather useful information from employers	2.13	2.43	+.30	.82	1.78$^{N.S.}$
Obtain adequate response rates from students	1.57	2.17	+.60	.78	3.73^{xxx}

N.S.= Not significant at the .05 confidence level.
x = Significant at the .05 confidence level.
xx = Significant at the .01 confidence level.
xxx = Significant at the .001 confidence level.

Appendix C

Participant Understanding of SAM Before and After the Workshops
Oakland Workshop (N=39)

Level of Understanding	Before Workshop (Percentages)	After Workshop	Change in Percent
Very Little	25.8	----	-25.8
Some	29.0	----	-29.0
Fairly Good	19.4	38.7	+19.3
Good	19.4	45.2	+25.8
Very Good	6.5	16.1	+ 9.6

Appendix C

Participant Pre-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Oakland Workshop (N=39)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	22.2	27.8	38.9	11.1
Identify major field of occupational students	11.1	30.6	44.4	13.9
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	52.8	33.3	13.9	----
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	37.1	45.7	14.3	2.9
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	31.4	45.7	20.0	2.9
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	48.6	37.1	14.3	----
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	19.4	41.7	25.0	13.9
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	19.4	38.9	33.3	8.3
Gather useful information from employers	28.6	42.9	20.0	8.6
Obtain adequate response rates from students	38.9	41.7	16.7	2.8

Appendix C

Participant Post-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Oakland (N=39)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	3.2	29.0	54.8	12.9
Identify major field of occupational students	3.3	26.7	50.0	20.0
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	22.6	45.2	29.0	3.2
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	----	45.2	48.4	6.5
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	3.2	54.8	38.7	3.2
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	6.5	45.2	45.2	3.2
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	6.5	25.8	54.8	12.9
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	12.9	51.6	32.3	3.2
Gather useful information from employers	3.2	29.0	61.3	6.5
Obtain adequate response rates from students	20.0	36.7	40.0	3.3

Appendix C

Comparisons of Participants' Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures Before and After the Workshop

Oakland Workshop (N=39)

SAM Procedure	Pretest Mean	Post-test Mean	Difference Between Means	Standard Deviation	T-value
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	2.43	2.73	.30	.83	1.96$^{N.S.}$
Identify major fields of occupational students	2.55	2.82	.27	1.03	1.44$^{N.S.}$
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	1.66	2.16	.50	.82	3.34^{xx}
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	1.96	2,65	.68	.80	4.61^{xxx}
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after leaving college	2.06	2.44	.38	1.01	2.01^{x}
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after they leave college	1.75	2.48	.72	.96	4.06^{xxx}
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	2.33	2.70	.37	.85	2.36^{x}
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	2.33	2.26	-.07	.74	-.49$^{N.S.}$
Gather useful information from employers	2.27	2.65	.38	.90	2.26^{x}
Obtain adequate response rates from students	1.93	2.27	.34	.93	1.98^{x}

N.S.= Not significant at the .05 confidence level.
x = Significant at the .05 confidence level.
xx = Significant at the .01 confidence level.
xxx = Significant at the .001 confidence level.

Appendix D

Participant Understanding of SAM Before and After the Workshops

San Diego Workshop (N=27)

Level of Understanding	Before Workshop (Percentages)	After Workshop	Change in Percent
Very Little	39.1	----	-39.1
Some	8.7	4.3	- 4.4
Fairly Good	21.7	17.4	- 4.3
Good	21.7	47.8	+26.1
Very Good	8.7	30.4	+21.7

Appendix D

Participant Pre-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
San Diego Workshop (N=27)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	25.0	33.3	37.5	4.2
Identify major field of occupational students	8.3	37.5	37.5	16.7
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	41.7	37.5	20.8	----
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	45.8	16.7	29.2	8.3
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	45.8	41.7	12.5	----
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	37.5	37.5	20.8	4.2
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	20.8	25.0	37.5	16.7
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	29.2	29.2	37.5	4.2
Gather useful information from employers	33.3	25.0	37.5	4.2
Obtain adequate response rates from students	37.5	41.7	12.5	8.3

Participant Post-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
San Diego Workshop (N=27)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	----	22.7	59.1	18.2
Identify major field of occupational students	4.5	9.1	68.2	18.2
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	----	59.1	31.8	9.1
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	4.5	36.4	59.1	----
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	4.5	31.8	59.1	4.5
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	----	40.9	54.5	4.5
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	----	27.3	50.0	22.7
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	----	59.1	36.4	4.5
Gather useful information from employers	9.1	27.3	50.0	13.6
Obtain adequate response rates from students	9.1	36.4	50.0	4.5

Comparisons of Participants' Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures Before and After the Workshop

San Diego Workshop (N=27)

SAM Procedure	Pretest Mean	Post-test Mean	Difference Between Means	Standard Deviation	T-value
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	2.15	3.05	.90	.91	4.41^{xxx}
Identify major fields of occupational students	2.50	3.15	.65	.93	3.11^{xx}
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	1.65	2.55	.90	.85	4.72^{xxx}
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	1.90	2.60	.70	.97	3.20^{xx}
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after leaving college	1.65	2.70	1.05	.88	5.29^{xxx}
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after they leave college	1.80	2.70	.90	.85	4.72^{xxx}
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	2.35	3.05	.70	.97	3.20^{xx}
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	2.05	2.50	.45	1.05	1.92$^{N.S.}$
Gather useful information from employers	2.00	2.75	.75	1.16	2.88^{xx}
Obtain adequate response rates from students	1.90	2.50	.60	1.14	2.35^{x}

N.S.= Not significant at the .05 confidence level.
x = Significant at the .05 confidence level.
xx = Significant at the .01 confidence level.
xxx = Significant at the .001 confidence level.

Appendix E

Participant Understanding of SAM Before and After the Workshops

Santa Ana Workshop (N=7)

Level of Understanding	Before Workshop	After Workshop	Change in Percent
	(Percentages)		
Very Little	----	----	----
Some	42.9	----	-42.9
Fairly Good	14.2	42.8	+28.6
Good	42.9	28.6	-14.3
Very Good	----	28.6	+28.6

Participant Pre-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Santa Ana Workshop (N=7)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5
Identify major field of occupational students	----	37.5	25.0	37.5
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	50.0	37.5	12.5	----
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	25.0	12.5	25.0	37.5
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	----	50.0	12.5	37.5
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	25.0	25.0	12.5	37.5
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	----	12.5	37.5	50.0
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	12.5	12.5	25.0	50.0
Gather useful information from employers	50.0	37.5	12.5	----
Obtain adequate response rates from students	50.0	25.0	25.0	----

Participant Post-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Santa Ana Workshop (N=7)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	----	42.9	14.3	42.9
Identify major field of occupational students	----	28.6	14.3	57.1
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	57.1	42.9	----	----
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	14.3	14.3	42.9	28.6
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	28.6	28.6	----	42.9
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	----	28.6	28.6	42.9
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	----	28.6	14.3	57.1
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	----	71.4	28.6	----
Gather useful information from employers	----	14.3	28.6	57.1
Obtain adequate response rates from students	28.6	42.9	28.6	----

Comparisons of Participants' Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures Before and After the Workshop

Santa Ana Workshop (N=7)

SAM Procedure	Pretest Mean	Post-test Mean	Difference Between Means	Standard Deviation	T-value
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	3.00	3.00	0	.58	0 N.S.
Identify major fields of occupational students	3.14	3.28	.14	.69	.55 N.S.
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	1.57	1.43	-.14	.90	.42 N.S.
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	2.71	2.85	.14	.90	.42 N.S.
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after leaving college	3.00	2,57	-.43	.78	1.44 N.S.
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after they leave college	2.71	3.14	.43	1.39	.81 N.S.
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	3.43	3.28	-.15	.38	1.00 N.S.
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	3.14	2.29	-.86	1.35	1.69 N.S.
Gather useful information from employers	1.57	3.42	1.85	1.21	4.04 xx
Obtain adequate response rates from students	1.71	2.00	.29	1.70	.44 N.S.

N.S.= Not significant at the .05 confidence level.
x = Significant at the .05 confidence level.
xx = Significant at the .01 confidence level.
xxx = Significant at the .001 confidence level.

Participant Understanding of SAM Before and After the Workshops

Visalia Workshop (N=12)

Level of Understanding	Before Workshop	After Workshop	Change in Percent
	(Percentages)		
Very Little	27.3	----	-27.3
Some	27.3	9.1	-18.2
Fairly Good	27.3	45.5	+18.2
Good	----	36.4	+36.4
Very Good	18.2	9.1	- 9.1

Appendix F

Participant Pre-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Visalia Workshop (N=12)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	8.3	41.7	33.3	16.7
Identify major field of occupational students	----	66.7	16.7	16.7
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	58.3	33.3	----	8.3
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	----	66.7	25.0	8.3
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	16.7	58.3	16.7	8.3
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	16.7	58.3	16.7	8.9
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	----	50.0	50.0	----
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	33.3	25.0	33.3	8.3
Gather useful information from employers	8.3	58.3	25.0	8.3
Obtain adequate response rates from students	25.0	66.7	----	8.3

Participant Post-Workshop Level of Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures
Visalia Workshop (N=12)

SAM Procedures	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	----	27.3	54.5	18.2
Identify major field of occupational students	----	18.2	54.5	27.3
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	9.1	36.4	27.3	27.3
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	----	18.2	72.7	9.1
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after they leave college	9.1	18.2	63.6	9.1
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after leaving college	----	27.3	45.5	27.3
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	----	18.2	72.7	9.1
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	9.1	54.5	27.3	9.1
Gather useful information from employers	----	27.3	54.5	18.2
Obtain adequate response rates from students	18.2	18.2	45.5	18.2

Comparisons of Participants' Confidence in Implementing SAM Procedures Before and After the Workshop

Visalia Workshop (N=12)

SAM Procedure	Pretest Mean	Post-test Mean	Difference Between Means	Standard Deviation	T-value
Identify and classify program completers and leavers	2.63	2.90	.27	.46	1.94$^{N.S.}$
Identify major fields of occupational students	2.54	3.09	.55	.52	3.46^{xx}
Verify and update addresses of former occupational students	1.54	2.72	1.18	1.07	3.63^{xx}
Obtain pertinent follow-up information from program completers before they leave college	2.45	2.90	.45	.52	2.89^{x}
Locate and obtain information from program leavers before or shortly after leaving college	2.18	2.72	.54	1.03	1.75$^{N.S.}$
Prepare students to provide college with needed information after they leave college	2.18	3.00	.82	.405	6.71^{xxx}
Prepare instruments to obtain needed information from students	2.54	2.90	.36	.67	1.79$^{N.S.}$
Obtain information to complete government vocational education follow-up forms	2.18	2.36	.18	1.07	.56$^{N.S.}$
Gather useful information from employers	2.36	2.90	.54	.93	1.94$^{N.S.}$
Obtain adequate response rates from students	1.90	2.63	.73	1.19	2.03$^{N.S.}$

N.S.= Not significant at the .05 confidence level.
x = Significant at the .05 confidence level.
xx = Significant at the .01 confidence level.
xxx = Significant at the .001 confidence level.

California Community Colleges Represented at

the Spring 1978 SAM Workshops

Community College

Allan Hancock
Bakersfield
Barstow
City College of San Francisco
College of the Desert
College of Marin
College of the Redwoods
College of San Mateo
College of the Sequoia
Compton
Consumes River
Contra Costa
Cuyamaca
El Camino
Foothill-De Anza Community College District
Golden West
Grossmont
Hartnell
Imperial Valley
Kern Community College District
Laney
Long Beach City College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Southwest
Los Angeles Trade-Technical
Los Angeles Valley
Mira Costa
Monterey Peninsula
Mt. San Antonio
North Orange Community College District
Orange Coast
Palomar
Pasadena City College
Peralta Community College District
Porterville
Reedley College
Riverside
Sacramento City College
Saddleback
San Diego City College
San Diego Evening College
San Diego Mesa
San Diego Miramar
San Joaquin Delta
San Jose City College
Santa Ana
Santa Monica
Santa Rosa
Southwestern
Sovonerson
Taft
West Los Angeles
Mission

Center for the Study of Community Colleges

The Center for the Study of Community Colleges is a non-profit corporation chartered in California in 1974. The mission is to conduct studies of post-secondary education for scientific and educational purposes.

Arthur M. Cohen, President, has studied community colleges extensively. He is a member of numerous advisory committees to community college-related projects and has written widely in the field. As a UCLA professor he teaches courses in higher education with emphasis on two-year colleges. His books include Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College, A Constant Variable, and College Responses to Community Demands.

John Lombardi, Vice President, has been associated with community colleges as instructor, dean, president, and superintendent. He formerly headed the Los Angeles Community College District. His writings include Managing Finances in Community Colleges.

Florence B. Brawer, Secretary-Treasurer, is a research educator with interest in community college personnel. She has written New Perspectives on Personality Development in College Students, and, with Arthur Cohen, co-authored Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor, and The Two-Year College Instructor Today.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 16 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES